

REMARKS

Claims 10-39 are pending in this application, with claims 10, 16, 22, 28 and 34 being independent. Claims 10, 16, 22, 28 and 34 have been amended.

Initially, applicant thanks the Examiner for the personal interview that was granted by the Examiner and conducted on November 17, 2004. The substance of the interview is set forth in the remarks below.

The specification has been amended to recite that Fig. 1C shows the auxiliary wiring line 106 being smaller in width than the wiring line 111, with the lines arranged such that opposite edges of the wiring line 111 extend beyond opposite edges of the auxiliary wiring line 6. Support for this amendment may be found in Fig. 1C. No new matter has been added.

As discussed at the interview, independent claim 10 has been amended to recite that a width of the first wiring line is smaller than a width of the second wiring line, and that the first and second wiring lines are arranged such that the second wiring line extends beyond opposite edges of the first wiring line. Support for this amendment may be found in the application at, for example, Fig. 1C, which shows the wiring line 111 (i.e., the second wiring line) extending beyond opposite edges of the auxiliary wiring line 106 (i.e., the first wiring line).

As also discussed at the interview, independent claim 16 has been amended to recite that the first wiring line includes at least a first portion and a second portion, that at least a portion of the second wiring line overlaps with the first wiring line, and that a third wiring line formed on a same surface as the first wiring line extends between the first and second portions of the first wiring line and across the second wiring line. Claim 16 further recites that the insulating film is interposed between the third wiring line and the first and second portions of the first wiring line, and between the third wiring line and the second wiring line, and that each of the first and second portions of the first wiring line is electrically connected with the second wiring line through contact holes opened in the insulating film. Support for this amendment may be found in the application at, for example, Figs. 1B and 1C, which show a wiring line 113 (i.e., the third wiring line) as being formed on the same layer as the auxiliary wiring line 106 (i.e., the first wiring line) and extending between portions of the auxiliary wiring line 106. Figs. 1B and 1C also show

multiple contact holes 108 connecting the wiring line 111 (i.e., the second wiring line) to each of the different portions of the wiring line 106 (i.e., the first wiring line).

Independent claim 22 has been amended similarly to claim 16, and independent claims 28 and 34 have been amended similarly to claim 10. Support for these amendments may be found as discussed above.

Claims 10-39 have been rejected as being anticipated by Takemura. With respect to claims 10, 28 and 34, and their dependent claims, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Takemura does not describe or suggest connecting the first and second wiring lines through a plurality of contact holes, or having the first wiring line be narrower than the second wiring line, with the second wiring line extending beyond opposite edges of the first wiring line, as recited in each of claims 10, 28 and 34. Takemura describes a gate electrode 205, which the Examiner has equated with the first wiring line, and an electrode 220, which the Examiner has equated with the second wiring line. However, as discussed at the interview, Takemura provides no indication that these electrodes are connected by multiple contact holes. Moreover, as illustrated in Fig. 2E of Takemura, the electrodes appear to have the same width. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the rejection of claims 10, 28 and 34, and of their dependent claims, should be withdrawn.

With respect to claims 16 and 22, and their dependent claims, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Takemura does not describe or suggest a first wiring line comprising at least two portions, a second wiring line formed over the first wiring line and connected to each of the portions through multiple contact holes, or a third wiring line that is formed on the same surface as the first wiring line and passes between the portions of the first wiring line and across the second wiring line, as recited in each of claims 16 and 22. As discussed at the interview, neither the electrodes 205 and 220, nor any other element of Takemura's system, includes such an arrangement. For example, as noted above, Takemura provides no indication that the electrodes 205 and 220 are connected by multiple contact holes.

Claims 10, 16 and 22 have been rejected as being anticipated by Matsushima. With respect to claim 10, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because

Matsushima does not describe or suggest having the first wiring line be narrower than the second wiring line, with the second wiring line extending beyond opposite edges of the first wiring line, as recited in claim 10. As noted by the Examiner, Matsushima describes, in Figs. 14A and 14B, an arrangement in which a terminal of an analog switch 133, which the Examiner has equated with the second wiring line, is formed over a signal wiring 135, which the Examiner has equated with the first wiring line, and connected to the signal wiring 135 through multiple contact holes. However, as discussed at the interview, Fig. 14B of Matsushima shows that the terminal of the analog switch 133 does not extend beyond the left edge of the signal wiring 135 and, accordingly, does not extend beyond opposite edges of the first wiring line, as recited in claim 10.

With respect to claims 16 and 22, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Matsushima does not describe or suggest a first wiring line comprising at least two portions, a second wiring line formed over the first wiring line and connected to each of the portions through multiple contact holes, or a third wiring line that is formed on the same surface as the first wiring line and passes between the portions of the first wiring line and across the second wiring line, as recited in each of claims 16 and 22. As discussed at the interview, if the signal wiring 135 corresponds to the first portion of the first wiring line, and the terminal of the analog switch 133 corresponds to the second wiring line, there is no other component that corresponds to the second portion of the first wiring line or the third wiring line. In particular, the transistor region 133a, which is the other component to which the terminal is connected through multiple contact holes, is not formed on the same surface as the signal wiring 135 and, accordingly, cannot constitute the recited second portion. With signal wiring 131, which is formed on the same surface as the signal wiring 135, is not connected to the terminal and does not pass under the terminal and, accordingly, cannot constitute the recited second portion or the recited third wiring line. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the rejections of claims 16 and 22 should be withdrawn.

Claims 10, 16 and 22, and their dependent claims 12, 13, 18, 19, 24 and 25, have been rejected as being anticipated by Shimada. With respect to claim 10 and its dependent claims,

applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because, like Takemura, Shimada does not describe or suggest connecting the first and second wiring lines through a plurality of contact holes, as recited in claim 10. Shimada describes an upper capacitor electrode 6, which the Examiner has equated with the first wiring line, and a capacitor common line 8, which the Examiner has equated with the second wiring line. However, as discussed at the interview, and illustrated in Fig. 1 of Shimada, the electrode 6 is connected to the common line 8 by a single contact hole 7c.

With respect to claims 16 and 22, and their dependent claims, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Shimada, like Takemura, does not describe or suggest a first wiring line comprising at least two portions, a second wiring line formed over the first wiring line and connected to each of the portions through multiple contact holes, or a third wiring line that is formed on the same surface as the first wiring line and passes between the portions of the first wiring line and across the second wiring line, as recited in each of claims 16 and 22. As discussed at the interview, neither the electrodes 6, the common line 8, nor any other element of Shimada's system, includes such an arrangement.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Enclosed is a \$300 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee (\$120) and the information disclosure statement fee (\$180). Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/10/04



John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331
40256336.doc